

**Remarks**

Claims 13-22 are currently pending in the application. Of these, Claims 12-15 and 19-22 have been rejected by the Examiner, and Claims 16-18 have been allowed if re-written in independent form. The Applicant declines to modify Claims 16-18 at this time, pending the Examiner's comments regarding the Remarks below.

The Examiner has requested that Figure 1 be corrected to include a legend indicating that Figure 1 is prior art. In response, the Applicant has provided a Replacement Sheet containing Figures 1, 2 and 6 in which the legend "PRIOR ART" has been added to Figure 1 as shown in the Replacement Sheet.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 13-15 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,355 (Nomura) and U.S. Patent 5,579,087 (Salgado).

The Applicant is in agreement with the Examiner that Nomura teaches a printer connected to a network for receiving and printing jobs in response to print requests from host computers, said printer including a localized print queue for storing job information for each of said host computers attempting to gain print access to said printer. However, Nomura does not teach the print queue having a facility for requesting print job content from the host computer which submitted the request. This limitation is not present in Nomura because the print jobs downloaded to the printer in Nomura include both job information and job content.

However, the Examiner states that this limitation is taught by Salgado, which teaches a printer having a user interface associated therewith for constructing print jobs. The Applicant is in disagreement with the Examiner's interpretation of Salgado. Salgado does not teach a facility

in a printer which is used by the printer to request print job content when a particular print request has reached at the top of a localized print queue. Instead, Salgado teaches a facility which happens to have a user interface associated with the printer (among other locations in the network), which allows a user to construct a print job for submission to a print queue. All of the activity described in Salgado occurs prior to the job being submitted to the print queue as a job. The Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to Salgado, column 7, lines 40-53 which states as follows:

Finally, it is necessary to select the various job parameters or attributes required to complete the job such as quantity requirements, quality requirements, and finished mode requirements. This is illustrated in block 274. ***Block 276 indicates a submit job step*** which can be a manual activation of an end of job build button or switch or an automatic response to completed events that triggers the initiation of the compilation procedure. ***This includes suitable network access and search and find operations to retrieve the selected segments and deliver the segments over the network to the designated printer or fax machine.*** Also understood are suitable scheduling and print management functions to queue or set a particular job for completion. (emphasis added)

The Applicant also directs the Examiner's attention to Figure 7 of Salgado where the last step therein is the submission of the print job at block 276. The rest of Figure 7 (i.e., boxes 260-274) shows the entire process described by Salgado, which occurs prior to the print job being queued at box 276 (The printer is actually not selected until near the end of Figure 7 at block 272, followed by the selection of print parameters at block 274 and the submission of the job to the print queue at block 276). Therefore, the limitation in Claim 13 that the print job content be requested "when said particular print request has reached the top of said localized print queue", is not disclosed by Salgado, because all of the processing in Salgado occurs prior to the job

submission. As noted in the passage from column 7, block 276 indicates the step "Submit Job" which triggers the initialization of a compilation procedure in which various portions of the print job are searched for and retrieved from various places in the network and assembled and sent to various printers or fax machines for rendering.

The combination of Salgado and Nomura would therefore teach a system wherein a user composes a print job from a variety of sources around the network, the components of the print job are retrieved and then sent to a particular printer where they are stored in a localized queue, which would include both print job information and print job content. The present application, however, claims a system wherein print job information (not content) is sent to a printer for queuing and when the job has reached the top of the queue (at the printer), the print content is requested from the host via the facility in Claim 13. Therefore, all the limitations of Claim 13 are not met by the combination of Nomura and Salgado, namely, a printer which includes a facility for establishing communications with the host computer for the purpose of requesting print job content *when a particular print request has reached the top of said localized print queue*. This limitation is not taught by the combination because in the combination of Nomura and Salgado, the print job content is already at the particular printer in a queue thereon. As such, there is no need to request the print job content when the job has reached the top of the localized print queue.

In addition, there is no suggestion in either Nomura nor Salgado to combine the two in the manner suggested by the Examiner. In Nomura, the entire print job content is sent to the printer when the print job is queued. *See* Nomura at column 3, lines 57-63, wherein it states that the data of a print job transferred to the printer consists of a print control data *and* job content.

Because the job content is already at the printer, there is no need for a facility as suggested in Salgado for retrieving print content from various sources in a network and sending it to the printer. As a result, the combination of Nomura and Salgado as suggested by the Examiner does not appear to make sense in the context of the present application. As stated above by the Applicant, the combination of the two results in a system wherein a print job is composed by a user using the facility of Salgado and then submitted to a print queue such as suggested by Nomura, in which case the entire print job content would be sent to the localized print queue and held there until the appropriate fonts have been downloaded to the printer.

Therefore, the combination of Salgado and Nomura does not teach or suggest the currently claimed invention and the Applicant respectfully submits that all currently pending claims of the application should be patentable in light of the Remarks herein.

**Conclusion**

Reasoned arguments have been provided showing why the combination of Nomura and Salgado do not teach the claimed invention and further, wherein the suggested combination of the Examiner is improper because neither reference teaches or suggests combining the references nor suggests a need for the combination of the two to meet the claims of the application.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that the claims as they stand are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant has included a fee for the requested continued examination of the application. However, if additional fees are required for any reason, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-4800 the necessary amount.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding these amendments or arguments, the Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the Applicant's attorney, listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dennis M. Carleton  
Registration No. 40,938  
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, P.C.  
One Oxford Centre  
301 Grant Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-1410  
(412) 562-1895

Attorney for Applicant